Process BOF

Cees de Laat, Dane Skow, David Martin

On behalf of the GFSG

Focus/Purpose

- The documents GFD1, GFD2 and GFD3 were initially created in consultation with IETF and the early GGF community at the beginning of the Global Grid Forum. Most of the process descriptions were modeled after IETF's procedures, and in particular GFD.1 is an adaptation of RFC2026. After 3 years of worked experience, some parts of the described processes need updating, or need further adaptation to our current process practices. Additionally, processes not addressed in these documents such as GGF internal and external name space should be discussed and documented.

    - The purpose of the process working group is to explore necessary updates to the founding documents of GGF and to explore other GGF processes and procedures that should be documented.

Scope

- This working group will examine GFD.1,2,3 and determine where policy and process need to be updated to reflect the way that GGF functions, or should function, today.

  - For example, a set of evaluation criteria are listed in GFD.2 for approval of working groups, however no similar criteria are listed for research groups. Similarly, guidelines for the operation of working groups exist but none exist for the operation of research groups.

Reminder, docs 1,2,3

1. ## Global Grid Forum Documents and Recommendations: Process and Requirements

   – Among the most useful products of Global Grid Forum (GGF) efforts will be documents that provide information, guidance, or recommendations. This memo defines five types of GGF document and a set of development and review processes for these documents. The process borrows heavily from the Internet Engineering Task Force Request for Comments document process and is intended to complement that process.

2. ## Global Grid Forum Structure

   – This memo proposes a modification of the present GGF group structure, which consists of a set of groups with wide variation in scope and operating objectives, all called "working groups." Three types of groups are defined in this memo "areas," "working groups," and "research groups" in the context of a proposed new GGF structure that is supportive of the de facto operations of the GGF. In accordance with the GGF's stated intent to emulate organizations such as the IETF, we define these three terms in a manner that is consistent with their use in the Internet Standards Process.

3. ## Global Grid Forum Management Structure and Processes

   – This document describes the management structure of the Global Grid Forum (GGF), including the roles of individual positions and committees and the processes for formation and approval of GGF working groups and research groups.

4

GFD 1 issues

- The following subjects will be discussed in the context of GFD.01:

- Changing the naming scheme to remove the "-I", "-R", "-E", and "C" designations

- The GFSG has decided to adopt the new IETF IPR policies. These must be edited to apply to GGF (note: this may require additional GGF documents to be created)

- Any other clarifications the group agrees to make.

GFD 2 issues

The following subjects will be discussed in the context of GFD.02:

- – adding a third type of group (application focus groups)
- – defining minimum expectations for non-working groups (research and application-focus) within GGF
- – updating the areas to reflect the current structure.
- – The life cycle of a WG producing standards documents needs to be revisited.
- – A GEN area for process and general issues wg's like this one.

GFD 3 issues

The following subjects will be discussed in the context of GFD.03:

- The NOMCOM process will need to be evaluated, discussed and documented.
- Selection of chair, confirmation of nominations, etc
- Exit strategy for old chairs (overlap, 1 year AL, etc?)
- Decision taking power of AL and AD's, voting, appeal, etc.

•The following subjects will be discussed to determine a best practice and to document accordingly:

- GGF internal name space (group naming, domain naming, etc.)
- GGF external name space (OID's).

Other issues, wish list (Dane)

- The distinction between the role of an editor and an author is missing. I like the distinction used for the roles in the IETF training (WG chair = process and fairness, doc editor = reconcile comments and track issues, author = provide initial document and major rewrites.) Do we want to place a limit on the number of authors (IETF=5 ?) and/or editors ?

- Def'n of Community Practice documents is unclear.

- Treatment of drafts should include general repository for "current" drafts. These drafts should expire after 6 months or so. Needs to clarify what it means for a draft to be discussed at GGF.

- Preference for text documents should be enforced and protected.

- The process for responding to issues raised in GFSG review and public comment should be clear and streamlined to allow for parallel action.

Other issues, wish list 2 (Dane, Cees)

- Clarify that we're looking for positive endorsements as well in the public comment period.

- Responsibilities and expectations on GFSG for review should be clarified and monitored. What portions of document process should be publicly visible (all/votes/status changes/...)

- Should most parts of the meeting notes of the GFSG be public

- Describe role and usage of a general announce list?

- The role of GridForge in document process and in working group action is not clear.
  - Where is it mandatory ?
  - where recommended ?
  - where left to discretion of group/author ?
  - And what does it mean for the mailing lists and decision taking?

Goals & Milestones

Goals

- Make appropriate updates to GFD.01 and GFD.02 and document these changes in a fashion consistent with the GGF document series.

- Analyze the need to update GFD.03 and, if needed, document these changes

- Determine and document best practices for the management of internal and external standard name spaces for GGF.

Milestones/deliverables

1. Identify required updates to GFD.01 - .03 (GGF11)

2. Complete and submit drafts for documents updating GFD.01 - .03 (GGF12)

3. Complete and submit draft defining best practice for GGF name space management (GGF12).

Management - 1

- Evidence of commitments to carry out WG tasks
  – The work will involve intensive investigation into the structure, processes, and procedures employed within the organizational structure of GGF and GFSG. As a result, a core team from GGF Corporation and from the GFSG will participate in much of the work.

- Pre-existing Document(s) (if any)
  – The work of this group will be focused primarily on the contents of GFD.01, GFD.02, GFD.03. Additionally, three documents describing the updates to the intellectual property policies of the IETF are in draft RFC status pending publication. These will be particularly useful during the IPR discussions of the group. Regarding NOMCOM procedures the IETF has 2 drafts becoming RFC soon to update RFC 2727 and 2777. Those will be used as input. Finally, relevant RFC's describing the management of name spaces by the IANA will also be useful references for this group.

Management - 2

- Exit strategy
  - The subject matter of this charter is particular to some of the open issues within the GFSG. It is likely that in the course of time, additional items will be identified that requires this group's analysis. The GFSG will determine when the charter of this group may be extended to include those items. If no items are added to the work of this group, the group will go into a dormant period until additional items are identified by the community or by the GFSG. At such time, the group will re-charter.

- When the new documents come out the previous documents GFD.1-3 will be given obsolete status.

7Q&A

1. Is the scope of the proposed group sufficiently focused?

    *   We think so

2. Are the topics that the group plans to address clear and relevant for the Grid research, development, industrial, implementation, and/or application user community?

    *   This is very relevant for the operation of the standards part of the Forum.

3. Will the formation of the group foster (consensus–based) work that would not be done otherwise?

    *   Yes. One could argue that a few GFSG members could undertake this work but workload has prevented that.

4. Do the group's activities overlap inappropriately with those of another GGF group or to a group active in another organization such as IETF or W3C?

    *   No. However, it is foreseen that liaison process issues most probably need interaction with those other bodies.

5. Are there sufficient interest and expertise in the group's topic, with at least several people willing to expend the effort that is likely to produce significant results over time?

    *   That is one of the purposes of the BOF.

6. Does a base of interested consumers (e.g., application developers, Grid system implementers, industry partners, end-users) appear to exist for the planned work?

    *   GFSG and the GGF itself in this case are the consumers.

7. Does the GGF have a reasonable role to play in the determination of the technology?

    *   Yes.

Charter

Process Working Group
Global Grid Forum, P2P Area

Administrative Information

- **Chairs:**
  - "Tony Genovese" <tony@es.net>
  - "Cees de Laat" <delaat@science.uva.nl>
- **Secretary(s)/Webmaster(s):**
  - "Stacey Bruno" <bruno@ggf.org>
  - "Steve Crumb" <scrumb@mcs.anl.gov>
- **Email list:**
  - proc-wg@ggf.org
- **Web page:**
  - http://forge.ggf.org/projects/proc-wg